

ARIZONA STATE VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINING BOARD
1740 W. ADAMS ST., SUITE 4600, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
PHONE (602) 364-1PET (1738) FAX (602) 364-1039
VETBOARD.AZ.GOV

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION FORM

If there is an issue with more than one veterinarian please file a separate Complaint Investigation Form for each veterinarian

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Received: July 1, 2020 Case Number: 21-01

A. THIS COMPLAINT IS FILED AGAINST THE FOLLOWING:

Name of Veterinarian/CVT: ABC Vaccination Clinic

Premise Name: THE VILLAGE INN
Premise Address: 375 W Ajo Way
City: TUCSON State: AZ Zip Code: 85713
Telephone: 520-741-7729

B. INFORMATION REGARDING THE INDIVIDUAL FILING COMPLAINT*:

Name: Norma Yunetm Vazquez
Address: [REDACTED]
City: [REDACTED] State: [REDACTED] Zip Code: [REDACTED]
Home Telephone: [REDACTED] Cell Telephone: [REDACTED]

*STATE LAW REQUIRES WE HAVE TO DISCLOSE YOUR NAME UNLESS WE CAN SHOW THAT DISCLOSURE WILL RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL HARM TO YOU, SOMEONE ELSE OR THE PUBLIC PER A.R.S. § 41-1010. IF YOU HAVE REASON TO BELIEVE THAT SUBSTANTIAL HARM WILL RESULT IN DISCLOSURE OF YOUR NAME PLEASE PROVIDE COPIES OF RESTRAINING ORDERS OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.

C. PATIENT INFORMATION (1):

Name: Blue
Breed/Species: Miniture Schnauzer
Age: 1 yr & md Sex: Female Color: Salt & pepper

PATIENT INFORMATION (2):

Name: _____
Breed/Species: _____
Age: _____ Sex: _____ Color: _____

D. VETERINARIANS WHO HAVE PROVIDED CARE TO THIS PET FOR THIS ISSUE:

Please provide the name, address and phone number for each veterinarian.

E. WITNESS INFORMATION:

Please provide the name, address and phone number of each witness that has direct knowledge regarding this case.

Edgar Clement, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Attestation of Person Requesting Investigation

By signing this form, I declare that the information contained herein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. Further, I authorize the release of any and all medical records or information necessary to complete the investigation of this case.

Signature: Norma Yanet Vazquez

Date: 7-1-20

F. ALLEGATIONS and/or CONCERNS:

Please provide all information that you feel is relevant to the complaint. This portion must be either typewritten or clearly printed in ink.

On June 25, 2020 I took my pet Blue to the Vet. My reason for my visit at this clinic was because my pet was pregnant. I provided all information I was asked in regards my pet pregnancy dates. I was told I was wrong and that the calculation didn't add up, which made me feel really concern at this point. Of course I know my pet and I knew her due date was coming really soon. But this visit to this place gave my frustration because it was my first time going thru a situation like this. I was scolded for not knowing the exact date, I was scolded for not giving the right food to my dog. They did an x-ray to see how my dog was doing and apparently they couldn't see anything clear except for one puppy. After they did

the x-rays I was told that she still had time left and that it was too early to know how she was doing with her puppies. Not to make this situation longer on Monday 6-29-20 my pet Blue delivered her puppies. This means this place lied to me or is absolutely not providing the right services to people. They charge me the visit, examination and x-rays. Honestly I feel I shouldn't have been charged for two reasons : ① I was not even told how my pet was doing and instead got scolded.

② X-rays didn't show anything and they told me to go back in about 1-2 weeks. Which this does not make sense to me. I'm writing this complaint because I was mistreated by Vet and the nurse assistant. It was my first time and last time going to this veterinary clinic. I'm not blaming this place to what it happened to me but I just something to be done.

I attended this place to get some guidance and education in regards my pet pregnancy and how to handle this situation

This place only took my money and made me feel really anxious about my pet's labor. Unfortunately, the day my pet was giving birth she struggled a lot and had some complications that could have been avoided if I knew better how to handle.

Case 21-01

The patient Blue Vasquez presented to ABC Wellness and Vaccination Clinic on 25 June 2020. The patient presented for a pregnancy/wellness exam and to determine the number of puppies the patient was carrying. Since due to Covid 19 only one person is allowed in the exam room, Blue Vasquez presented with a man whose name I don't know as her careperson. When asked the reason for Blue's visit, I and the veterinary assistant with me were told to determine the number of puppies the patient is carrying. When asked about the conception date, we were given the date of May 26, 2020. This same information was given to the veterinary assistant and entered on the patient chart under chief complaints. I replied that this date was less than 45 days and, thus, too early for radiographic exposure to a pregnant uterus. The care person then called Ms Vasquez to whom I relayed the information about the conception date we were given. Ms Vasquez then said over the phone that the conception date was April 27, 2020 and the veterinary assistant noted this new date on the record. Ms Vasquez then subsequently exchanged places in the exam room once the former careperson (man) left. Once Ms Vasquez entered the room and I proceeded to examine the patient. The patient Blue presented with an enlarged abdomen and mammary glands which I attributed to pregnancy. During the exam I asked what Blue was being fed and was told about 1 cup of dry dog food daily, which I mentioned seems low for a pregnant mother preparing for birth and lactation. Thus, I recommended to Ms Vasquez that Blue be fed puppy food as the increased calories, protein and calcium would better prepare for birth and lactation. I mentioned that smaller dogs may be more susceptible to eclampsia (milk fever) and a higher calcium diet can help prevent that potential problem. I reiterated that we could take radiographs to determine the number of puppies Blue is carrying and followed up by the veterinary assistant giving Ms Vasquez a written estimate for the costs of an office visit and radiographs, which Ms Vasquez signed authorizing us to take radiographs of Blue.

Since Ms Vasquez only wanted us to determine how many puppies Blue was carrying, the veterinary assistants took one V/D radiograph of the abdomen. However, from this radiograph I could only see 2 fetal skeletons. I asked the assistants to take a 2nd radiograph in an attempt to get better resolution though due to pregnancy settings were adjusted mildly to prevent potential excess x ray exposure to puppies (especially since we were given 2 different conception dates). Yet ABC only charged for one radiograph. Subsequently, I asked the veterinary assistant supervisor how many fetal skeletons she could identify. The supervisor agreed with me and only felt comfortable identifying 2 skeletons. This information was relayed to Ms Vasquez that I could identify 2 fetal skeletons but I could not say if there were more. I did say to Ms Vasquez that though I didn't know about delivery dates, she could begin taking Blue's temperature daily because body temperatures tended to drop several degrees (3-4) about 24 hours before a pregnant dog gives birth. I was not asked any questions in regards to what to expect at delivery and I did not express that Blue had time because I have no idea when parturition would occur. Blue was subsequently discharged. However, I will end by stating that ABC Wellness and Vaccination clinic complied with the owner's request to provide a wellness exam and radiographs for Blue Vasquez.

CASE 21-01

This information can be verified by the veterinary assistant working with me who was present during the exam and helped to take radiographs.

Handwritten portion:

6/25/20 Client# 43252 Owner's Name: Vazquez-Yanneth, Norma

Patient Name: Blue (78694) Breed: Mini Schnauzer (S/P) Sex: F Age: 10/18

Exam, Weight 21.1 lbs T: 99.8 P: 150 R: 30, No Current meds, Eating and drinking ok, No Vomiting or diarrhea, Vaccines up to date, No Microchip

Pregnant dog/Wellness Exam, Mated May 26, Owner wants to know how many puppies, April 27

BAR 3/5 Pigmented
<2secs

Gravid
uterus
Pregnant

Radiographs - difficult to clearly see fetal skeletons, 2 seen

Recommend feeding puppy food for enhanced calories and increased Ca associated with nursing puppies and milk production needed

Carroll R Gomes, DVM

(initials)

DOUGLAS A. DUCEY
- GOVERNOR -

VICTORIA WHITMORE
- EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR -



ARIZONA STATE VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINING BOARD

1740 W. ADAMS STREET, STE. 4600, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

PHONE (602) 364-1-PET (1738) • FAX (602) 364-1039

VETBOARD.AZ.GOV

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

TO: Arizona State Veterinary Medical Examining Board

FROM: PM Investigative Committee: Adam Almaraz - Chair
Amrit Rai, DVM
Cameron Dow, DVM
Brian Sidaway, DVM

STAFF PRESENT: Tracy A. Riendeau, CVT - Investigations
Marc Harris – Assistant Attorney General

RE: Case: 21-01

Complainant(s): Norma Yaneth Vazquez

Respondent(s): Carlotta Groves, DVM (License: 3792)

SUMMARY:

Complaint Received at Board Office: 7/1/20

Committee Discussion: 11/3/20

Board IIR: 12/9/20

APPLICABLE STATUTES AND RULES:

Laws as Amended August 2018
(Lime Green); Rules as Revised
September 2013 (Yellow)

On June 25, 2020, "Blue," a 1.5-year-old female Miniature Schnauzer was presented to Respondent for a pregnancy evaluation and to determine the number of puppies the dog was carrying. There was initially some confusion on when the dog was bred; radiographs were performed, two puppies were seen and the dog was discharged with recommendations to feed the dog puppy food during the pregnancy.

Complainant was noticed and appeared telephonically.

Respondent was noticed and appeared telephonically.

The Committee reviewed medical records, testimony, and other documentation as described below:

- Complainant(s) narrative: Norma Yaneth Vazquez
- Respondent(s) narrative/medical record: Carlotta Groves, DVM

PROPOSED 'FINDINGS of FACT':

1. On June 25, 2020, the dog was presented to Respondent for a pregnancy evaluation. Due to COVID-19, the premises was only allowing one person in the exam room with the doctor. Respondent and her technical staff member evaluated the dog in the exam room with the caregiver, Mr. Vazquez, not Complainant. Mr. Vazquez relayed that they wanted to know how many puppies the dog was carrying. When asked, Mr. Vazquez advised that the dog was breed on May 26, 2020 – he was advised that since it has been less than 45 days, it was too early for radiograph exposure to a pregnant uterus.
2. Mr. Vazquez called Complainant who then corrected the conception date to April 27, 2020. Complainant then switched places with Mr. Vazquez in the exam room.
3. Respondent examined the dog; the dog had a weight = 21.1 pounds, a temperature = 99.8 degrees, a heart rate = 150bpm and a respiration rate = 30rpm. Respondent noted an enlarged abdomen and swollen mammary glands. Respondent asked Complainant what was being fed to the dog. She was told 1 cup of dry dog food. Respondent recommended feeding the dog puppy food for increased calories, protein and calcium to better prepare for birth and lactation. Respondent offered to take radiographs to determine the number of puppies the dog was carrying; an estimate for the costs of the office visit and radiographs was provided to Complainant and approved.
4. Radiographs were taken and it was determined that two (2) puppy skeletons were identified. Complainant was advised of the radiographic findings but Respondent could not be sure if there were not more. She advised that Complainant could begin taking the dog's temperature daily as body temperatures tend to drop several degrees approximately 24 hours prior to giving birth. The dog was discharged.
5. On June 29, 2020, according to Complainant, the dog delivered her puppies. She did not say how many in her complaint (it was determined 5 puppies were birthed – 1 died). Complainant expressed concerns that she was scolded for not knowing the exact date the dog was breed as well as for what she was feeding the dog. She was told that Respondent could only see one puppy clearly and to return in 1 – 2 weeks for a recheck. Complainant felt she was mistreated by Respondent and technical staff.
6. Complainant stated that she went to Respondent's premises for guidance and education with respect to her dog's pregnancy. Complainant reported the dog experienced complications during pregnancy that could have been avoided if she knew how to handle the situation better.
7. Respondent stated she was not asked any questions on what Complainant should expect at delivery and Respondent did not express the dog had time because she had no idea when parturition would occur.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

The Committee discussed that there was a communication issue between the two individuals. They felt Respondent provided information on the dog's condition and how to nutritionally prepare the mother for birth. Respondent was off on the number of puppies on the radiograph but that can be difficult to assess.

The Committee felt that Respondent provided the information that Complainant requested and it is difficult to determine how the communication transpired. There were incorrect breeding dates reported initially to Respondent. The Committee did not feel there was a violation of the Veterinary Practice Act.

COMMITTEE'S PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS of LAW:

The Committee concluded that no violations of the Veterinary Practice Act occurred.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION:

Motion: It was moved and seconded the Board:

Dismiss this issue with no violation.

Vote: The motion was approved with a vote of 4 to 0.

The information contained in this report was obtained from the case file, which includes the complaint, the respondent's response, any consulting veterinarian or witness input, and any other sources used to gather information for the investigation.

TR

Tracy A. Riendeau, CVT
Investigative Division